

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3 and 5-14 are pending in the application.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldman (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,469) in view of Uramoto (U.S. Patent no. 6,311,198).

The claims are amended, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

The independent claims are 9-13.

Claims 9 to 12 are amended to clarify that objects indicative of documents are laid out and displayed in chronological order even if the objects are not recognized as relevant (i.e., even if the objects are not connected with an association line).

The Office Action acknowledges that Feldman does not explicitly disclose maintaining a chronological order of different documents forming each document pair; so the Office Action relies upon Uramoto.

Uramoto relied upon columns 1 and 5 and FIG. 8 discuss calculating a similarity among articles which appear in chronological order, and creating a relation graph of articles a similarity between which exceeds a reference value (FIG. 8). In Uramoto, a similarity between two articles (d_i, d_j) is calculated on condition of $i < j$. In displaying the relation graph, articles (d_i, d_j) having a similarity exceeding the reference value therebetween are displayed with $i < j$ maintained (the oldest article is placed leftmost while the newest one is placed rightmost). However, in Uramoto, this is true only for articles a similarity between which exceeds a reference value and which are recognized as relevant. For instance, in FIG. 8, d_7 is positioned on the left side of d_6 even though d_7 could be a newer article than d_6 . The same thing can be said for d_8, d_9 , and d_{10} .

By contrast, amended claim 9 requires that objects indicative of documents are displayed in chronological order even if the objects are not recognized as relevant (i.e., even if the objects are not connected with an association line). A prima facie case of obviousness based upon Feldman and Uramoto cannot be established, because there is no evidence, either expressly or implicitly, that one skilled in the art would combine Uramoto with Feldman and then further modify Uramoto to lay out articles according to the amended language of claim, namely “displaying the relation chart composed of the objects and the association lines, ***at least***

some[[one]] of the objects indicative of the document pairs having relevancy being displayed while maintaining with chronological order maintained irrespective of whether the some of the objects are connected with the association linesof the document pairs.”

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 and allowance of claim 9 is requested. Independent claims 10-12 require limitations similar to the discussed limitations of amended claim 9.

In addition, in contrast to any combination of Feldman and Uramoto, independent claim 13 requires “**displaying** a relational chart illustrating documents having relevancy and lines connected between the each document pair according to the calculated degree of relevancy **and maintaining a time relation of the document pairs in chronological order**,” which is not disclose either expressly or implicitly by a combination of Feldman and Uramoto when Uramoto FIG. 8 only article pairs that have a similarity exceeding a threshold. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 and allowance of claim 13 is requested.

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/812,021

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____ September 14, 2009 _____

By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501